

IN THE COURT OF APPEALS OF THE STATE OF IDAHO

Docket No. 36253

STATE OF IDAHO,)	2010 Unpublished Opinion No. 393
)	
Plaintiff-Respondent,)	Filed: March 24, 2010
)	
v.)	Stephen W. Kenyon, Clerk
)	
MIGUEL CHARLES JOYNER,)	THIS IS AN UNPUBLISHED
)	OPINION AND SHALL NOT
Defendant-Appellant.)	BE CITED AS AUTHORITY
)	

Appeal from the District Court of the Fourth Judicial District, State of Idaho, Ada County. Hon. Cheri C. Copsey, District Judge.

Judgment of conviction and unified life sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years, for felony violation of a no contact order enhanced for being a persistent violator, affirmed.

Molly J. Huskey, State Appellate Public Defender; Eric D. Fredericksen, Deputy Appellate Public Defender, Boise, for appellant.

Hon. Lawrence G. Wasden, Attorney General; Jessica M. Lorello, Deputy Attorney General, Boise, for respondent.

Before GUTIERREZ, Judge; GRATTON, Judge;
and MELANSON, Judge

PER CURIAM

Miguel Charles Joyner was found guilty of felony violation of a no-contact order, I.C. § 18-920, and being a persistent violator, I.C. § 19-2514. The district court sentenced Joyner to a unified life sentence, with a minimum period of confinement of ten years. Joyner filed an I.C.R. 35 motion for reduction of sentence, which the district court denied. Joyner appeals.

Sentencing is a matter for the trial court's discretion. Both our standard of review and the factors to be considered in evaluating the reasonableness of the sentence are well established and need not be repeated here. *See State v. Hernandez*, 121 Idaho 114, 117-18, 822 P.2d 1011, 1014-15 (Ct. App. 1991); *State v. Lopez*, 106 Idaho 447, 449-51, 680 P.2d 869, 871-73 (Ct. App.

1984); *State v. Toohill*, 103 Idaho 565, 568, 650 P.2d 707, 710 (Ct. App. 1982). When reviewing the length of a sentence, we consider the defendant's entire sentence. *State v. Oliver*, 144 Idaho 722, 726, 170 P.3d 387, 391 (2007). Applying these standards, and having reviewed the record in this case, we cannot say that the district court abused its discretion.

Therefore, Joyner's judgment of conviction and sentence are affirmed.